

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly

<http://nvs.sagepub.com/>

Factors Influencing the Motivation of Turkey's Community Volunteers

Ismet Boz and Serap Palaz

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 2007 36: 643 originally published online 13

September 2007

DOI: 10.1177/0899764006298364

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://nvs.sagepub.com/content/36/4/643>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action](http://www.arnova.org)

Additional services and information for *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://nvs.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://nvs.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://nvs.sagepub.com/content/36/4/643.refs.html>

Factors Influencing the Motivation of Turkey's Community Volunteers

Ismet Boz

Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University

Serap Palaz

Balikesir University

Although Turkish society has traditionally valued volunteering, it has not fully utilized the potential of such contributions. This is because the country lacks professional volunteer organizations, and limited research has evaluated Turkish volunteers. The main aims of the current study were to describe the personal characteristics of Turkey's community volunteers and to determine the influence of various motivational factors on their decision to serve in the Community Volunteer Foundation. The participants were a randomly selected sample of 175 community volunteers from different regions of Turkey. Findings showed that the average community volunteer was a 22-year-old, male college student pursuing a career in engineering, economics, or business. The most important motivational factors for volunteering were altruism, affiliation, and personal improvement (in that order). Completing an orientation course before working as a volunteer was considered useful. Recognition, by contrast, was not considered to be a vital factor.

Keywords: *community volunteers; voluntary sector; motivation; Turkey*

Turkey's Community Volunteer Foundation (*Toplum Gonulluleri* in Turkish, or TOG) is a nonprofit organization founded in December 2002, with the vision of realizing social peace, solidarity, and change through the participation and leadership of youth. Its main mission is

to contribute to the formation of youth with social awareness and self-esteem, encourage young volunteers to develop and realize various social service projects, transform the energy of youth towards social benefit, provide the participation, guidance and assistance of adult volunteers who believe in the synergy youth is capable of creating and who can financially and/or socially support them towards social benefit. (TOG, 2004, p. 2)

Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, vol. 36, no. 4, December 2007 643-661
DOI: 10.1177/0899764006298364

© 2007 Association for Research on Nonprofit Organizations and Voluntary Action

The essential principles of the TOG are “impartiality, transparency and accountability, local participation, teamwork, entrepreneurship, and learning” that aims to increase both the level and quality of education, promotion of lifelong learning, and creation of public consciousness in the field of education (TOG, 2004, p. 4).

The members of the TOG are mostly university students aged between 17 and 25 years. These young people provide volunteer services to support formal education by providing literacy courses, basic computer instruction, English courses, interactive communication courses, problem-solving courses, and civil right courses for primary and high school students. They also provide training in basic health, first aid, traffic awareness and road safety, disaster awareness and intervention, art, project management and teamwork, entrepreneurship, and mother-child health. In addition, they provide volunteer labor for projects of various types, including reforestation, environmental protection, garbage collection, and school construction and repair (TOG, 2004, p. 4).

Although volunteering has traditionally been valued by Turkish society, it has remained at the individual level for years. The main types of volunteer service have been the following: providing financial help for the poor and accommodation for the homeless; donating to schools, mosques, and foundations; and contributing labor for the construction and maintenance of rural roads, mosques, schools, and health care centers. In addition, farmers helping each other to complete work during sowing and harvesting periods has been the main form of cooperation among rural people (Ayyildiz, 1975; Boz, 2005; Ozkaya, Karaturhan, & Boyaci, 2003).

In a modern society, the ability to get the most out of voluntary contributions depends on professional organizations, through which volunteers can be identified, selected, oriented, trained, utilized, recognized, evaluated, and supervised (Florida Cooperative Extension Service, or FCES, 2001). To retain the current volunteers within an organization and to increase the numbers of new recruits, the motivational factors influencing individuals to provide voluntary contributions for an organization should be scientifically investigated. Studies addressing this issue in Turkey are lacking, so the current article is intended to fill this gap.

The primary purpose of the present study was to determine the motivational factors that influenced the youths to participate in the volunteer activities of the TOG in Turkey. More specifically, this study intended to achieve the following:

1. To describe community volunteers based on the following demographic characteristics: (a) age, (b) gender, (c) college major, (d) region, (e) marital status, (f) monthly expenditure, (g) father's occupation, (h) mother's occupation, (i) parents' place of residence, and (j) parents' family income;
2. To describe community volunteers based on their perception regarding the influence of (a) selected motivational factors, (b) an orientation program, (c) and recognition; and

3. To determine whether any factors could be identified from among the motivational factors selected.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

As this article deals with factors influencing the motivation of a specific group of people who provide volunteer services for an organization (TOG), it is useful to describe the basic concept of motivation. *Motivation* is defined as an internal state or condition (sometimes described as a need, desire, or want) that serves to activate or energize behavior and to give it direction (Kleinginna & Kleinginna, 1981). According to this definition, the internal state or condition activates behavior and gives it direction: The desire or want energizes and directs goal-oriented behavior, and the influence of the need or desire determines the intensity and direction of the behavior (Huiitt, 2001).

Motivation theories are divided into two broad categories: content motivation theories and process motivation theories (Lussier, 1999). Content motivation theories include Maslow's (1970) needs hierarchy, Alderfer's ERG (existence, relatedness, and growth needs; 1972) theory, Herzberg's (1968) two-factor theory, and McClelland's (1972) manifest needs theory. Process motivation theories include Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory, Adams's (1963) equity theory, and Skinner's (1971) reinforcement theory.

In the published literature, these theories have been used to address various aspects of the question of why people volunteer; that is, what are the main motivators that direct individuals to perform volunteer service for an organization? To analyze how particular theories of motivation contribute to our understanding of volunteer behavior, Fisher and Cole (1993, p. 60) divided motivators into three categories: needs, reasons, and benefits. Among these categories, the first group of theories assumes that individual behavior is a result of internal needs, the second assumes that individuals have conscious reasons for their behavior, and the third assumes that behavior is prompted by the expected benefit of rewards.

NEEDS

Maslow (1970) describes motivation as the individual's response to internal needs. This description of motivation indicates that internal needs influence individuals to participate in volunteer activities. According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, all individuals have various needs that are arranged in levels resembling a pyramid. Once a lower level need is met, the individual begins to seek opportunities that provide satisfaction for higher level needs. The satisfaction of lower level needs has a motivational effect, prompting individuals to investigate new opportunities to meet higher level needs. Maslow's hierarchy of needs (in ascending order) includes the following: (a) physiological needs, such as the need for shelter, air, water, and food; (b) safety needs, such as the need for security and protection; (c) social needs, such as the need to feel part of a group

or organization; (d) self-esteem needs, such as the need to feel worthwhile and respected by others; and (e) self-actualization needs, such as the need to realize one's full potential.

McClelland (1992, pp. 87-99) suggests that three major needs motivate individuals to behave in certain ways: the need for achievement, the need for affiliation, and the need for power. *Achievement* refers to the need to accomplish a task. *Affiliation* refers to the need to be concerned about one's relationships with others. *Power* refers to the need to have control over others. Each of these needs influences the motivation of individuals; however, in different situations, some of these needs might have stronger or weaker motivational influence: "The more frequently and intensely these needs are satisfied, the longer the motivation will last," according to Henderson (1980, p. 62).

The need for achievement motivates individuals to keep up with the standards set by the organization with which they are involved. To accomplish tasks and duties, individuals need to analyze the possible solutions to the problems that they encounter. People need to set their goals and objectives to clarify where they are going, how to get there, and how to determine whether they have achieved their goals and objectives. These conditions motivate individuals to seek adequate feedback for every step of the goal-achievement process. In addition, the need for achievement motivates individuals to respond to various challenges, to be concerned with excellence, and to accept the various levels of risk involved in accomplishing their goals and objectives (Henderson, 1980, p. 62).

Henderson suggests that the need for affiliation motivates individuals to be concerned with their relationships with others. Affiliation-motivated persons are

concerned about the quality of personal relationships, seek the company of others as much as possible, enjoy social interaction, want to be liked, wish to avoid conflict, dislike playing or working alone, go out of the work place to meet people and make friends, and enjoy stable relationships. These persons usually want to help people and develop warm and friendly relationships. (p. 63)

The need for power also has an influence on the initiation of volunteer efforts within an organization. According to McClelland (1992, p. 92), the need for power motivates individuals to be concerned with their reputation or position, to establish authority or control over others, to give advice, and to make their ideas dominant. However, Veroff (1992) suggests that

a person with strong power motivation does not constantly seek dominance or assertiveness over others, but rather is concerned only with making sure that, if the person wants to influence, the means by which influence can occur are in that person's control. (p. 278)

CONSCIOUS REASONS

Research shows that conscious reasons are important motivators for individuals to become involved in voluntary activities. Fisher and Cole (1993, p. 62) classified conscious reasons into three categories: (a) reasons that focus on the task to be performed and the location or setting in which the individual volunteers; (b) reasons that focus on the client population, such as altruistic responses and altruism combined with self interest; and (c) reasons that focus on the volunteers themselves. Often, the task to be performed influences the motivation of potential volunteers to become involved in voluntary activities. If the task is too complicated, potential volunteers might be particularly reluctant to begin contributing to the performance of the task. In addition, the location or setting of a volunteer activity also influences the decision as to whether to initiate volunteer service. For example, if the location or setting of the volunteer service does not provide adequate possibilities for the individuals to perform the tasks, it becomes extremely difficult for organizations to obtain voluntary contributions.

Altruism is considered to motivate individuals who focus on the client population when they volunteer. It reflects the time, money, and energy that an individual sacrifices for the benefit of society at large. According to Schram (1985, p. 14), altruism has long been thought of as the major reason for participating in volunteer services. However, some authors consider altruism as only one of the many reasons that motivate an individual to volunteer. They suggest that the motives of altruism and egoism can act together to motivate individuals to perform volunteer service. Although people might intend to provide volunteer service for an organization mainly for altruistic reasons, they can also gain some pleasure, affirm the value of participation, meet new people and make new friends, increase their self esteem, and gain new skills and competencies (Clary & Snyder, 1991, 2002; Okun, Barr, & Herzog, 1998; D. H. Smith, 1981, 1994). Similar ideas about altruism-related volunteerism come from C. P. Smith, Atkinson, McClelland, and Veroff (1992), who argue that persons who consider the main reason for their volunteer work as being altruism do not admit that they have other self-satisfying reasons for volunteering. Therefore, according to C. P. Smith et al., a combination of altruism and self-interest, in which altruism is a minor motivator, is considered to be the main reason for volunteerism. Fisher and Cole (1993) identified the reasons for volunteering that focus on the volunteers themselves as "deriving enjoyment from working with the client population, socializing with other volunteers, making new acquaintances, repaying benefits received and enhancing prestige, fulfilling a requirement, gaining career-related experiences, and increasing business profit" (p. 62).

BENEFITS

Benefits are considered to be one of the major motivations influencing individuals to undertake voluntary activities. The exchange theory suggests that human activities are based on an exchange of costs for benefits (Schram, 1985). The costs of human contributions to volunteer services include time, money, and energy. The benefits include the rewards received from voluntary activity. Exchange theory suggests that as far as human behavior is profit motivated, volunteer activities will be chosen if rewards are greater than costs. Schram further suggests that an individual's decision to volunteer depends on whether the organization offers appropriate rewards as well as the perceived value of these rewards and the costs to the individual. Therefore, it becomes relatively difficult to recruit volunteers on an exchange basis, as rewards can be motivators for participation and costs can inhibit participation.

Similarly, expectancy theory (Lawless, 1972, p. 282) suggests that individuals are involved in different volunteer roles because they expect to obtain satisfaction from voluntary service, to receive recognition and rewards at the end of the process, and to make contributions to both the organization and society. Expecting satisfaction from voluntary service could be related to the volunteers themselves or the client for whom they volunteer. Although some individuals expect satisfaction from achieving their own goals, others expect satisfaction from seeing the people for whom they volunteer achieving their goals. Expecting recognition or rewards at the end of volunteer service and expecting satisfaction for the self are the main motivators of the exchange theory. However, the expectancy theory suggests that individuals perform volunteer service not only for recognition, rewards, and their own satisfaction but also for the satisfaction of other individuals and for the benefits of society at large.

Based on the theories of Katz (1960) and M. Smith, Bruner, and White (1956), another theory explaining why people volunteer assumes that value, understanding, sociability, career, protection, and enhancement are the six major motivational functions served by volunteerism (Clary et al., 1998; Clary & Snyder, 1999).

Value is the "function that may be served by involvement in volunteer service centers on the opportunities that volunteerism provides for individuals to express values related to altruistic and humanitarian concerns for others" (Clary et al., 1998, p. 1517). People who feel happy when they make others happy, who want to help others, who feel needed, who are concerned about those less fortunate than themselves, and who think volunteering is a humanitarian issue might put more value on volunteering than other people.

Understanding is the function that refers to "the opportunity for volunteerism to permit new learning experiences and the chance to exercise knowledge, skills, and abilities that might otherwise go unpracticed" (Clary et al., 1998, p. 1518). According to this function, individuals who initiate

voluntary service or continue to work as volunteers in various organizations expect to receive benefits related to self-development, learning, and updated skills and abilities through their volunteer service.

Sociability, the "third function that may be served by volunteering, reflects motivations concerning relationships with others" (Clary et al., 1998, p. 1518). If individuals want to meet new people and make new friends, to improve their social relationships, and to share their knowledge and skills with other volunteers, they might tend to provide voluntary service for different organizations.

Career-related benefit is the fourth function influencing an individual's decision to volunteer. This is based on the utilitarian function described by Katz (1960), which suggests that individuals who are involved in volunteer activities might seek career opportunities, which will assist them to maximize their utility.

The fifth function is related to protecting individuals from negative conditions. Referring to the defensive and externalization concerns of Katz (1960) and M. Smith et al. (1956), respectively, the authors suggest that protection-related motivations "center on protecting the ego from negative features of the self and, in the case of volunteerism, may serve to reduce guilt over being more fortunate than others and to address one's own personal problems" (Clary et al., 1998, p. 1518).

The last function is enhancement, which acts in the opposite direction to the protective function. Enhancement "involves a motivational process that centers on the ego's growth and development and involves positive strivings of the ego" (Clary et al., 1998, p. 1518).

Studies in the field have found different answers to the question of why people volunteer. In a study in Washington (Hiller, 1983), affiliation motives had the greatest influence on adult 4-H leaders in motivating them to provide volunteer service, followed by power and achievement, respectively. Henderson (1981) found that the reasons motivating adults to provide volunteer service for 4-H were to be with their children, to help people, to be associated with youth, and to have an influence on how people learn and grow. Rouse and Clawson (1992) analyzed the motives and incentives of older adult volunteers in the Piedmont area of North Carolina and found that 31.1% of older adult volunteers were motivated by the need for affiliation, 41.0% were motivated by the need for achievement, and only 3.6% were motivated by reasons of power. The Culp (1997) study in Indiana found that the primary motivators that influence individuals to provide volunteer service for 4-H were as follows: (a) youth (issue/cause motive), (b) the 4-H program (affiliation motive), and (c) perceived need (personal motive). The Boz and Verma (2001) Louisiana study found that adults were motivated by achievement, affiliation, and altruistic reasons to serve as volunteer leaders for the 4-H youth organization. Finally, the Sherer (2004) study showed that 60% of the volunteers serving in the Israeli National Service were motivated by altruistic reasons.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The target population for this study was defined as students serving in the TOG. Turkey is geographically divided into seven regions, and there are a number of universities in each region. Because community volunteers perform voluntary service in every region of the country, and the questionnaires were completed by respondents from these regions, the target population was community volunteers nationwide. The minimum required sample size was determined using the Cochran (1977) sample-size-determination formula. The minimum usable sample needed was 171 individuals, based on the data collected using a 5-point, Likert-type scale, with an acceptable margin of error of 3% and an alpha level of $p = .05$. Sample size was calculated as follows:

$$N_0 = t^2 s^2 / d^2$$

$$N_0 = (1.96)^2 (1)^2 / (0.03 \times 5)^2$$

$$N_0 = 3.8416 \times 1 / 0.0225$$

$$N_0 = 171.$$

The study procedure and the method of selecting participants are described below.

Turkey's seven geographical regions are administratively divided into 81 provinces. The TOG is active in 4 of the 18 provinces in the Black Sea Region, 4 of the 15 provinces in the Eastern Anatolian Region, 4 of the 13 provinces in the Central Anatolian Region, 8 of the 11 provinces in the Marmara Region, 5 of the 8 provinces in the Aegean Region, 5 of the 8 provinces in the Mediterranean Region, and 3 of the 8 provinces in the Southeastern Anatolian Region. As an accurate frame of the target population was not available to the researchers, the sample size of 171 individuals could not be proportionally distributed according to the number of community volunteers in each of the seven regions. However, the more provinces within a region that the TOG was active in, the more questionnaires were provided.

Data collection was completed during two Social Sensitivity Projects (SSPs, or *Atak* in Turkish) held in the Balikesir and Kahramanmaraş Provinces in April 2003. An SSP is a 1- to 3-day nationwide project carried out by volunteers coming from all seven regions. The purpose is to attract local public attention for social and community issues, and to motivate young volunteers to perform their services (TOG, 2006).

Instructions on how to complete the questionnaires were provided. Respondents were informed that any information that they shared would be used only for scientific purposes. No information about the identity of the volunteers was required.

In total, 220 questionnaires were delivered and 184 returned. The initial examination of the returned questionnaires showed that nine were incomplete;

these were therefore excluded from the data analysis process. The number of usable questionnaires was 175, which exceeded the calculated sample size of 171. In terms of geographic region, 68 respondents were from the Marmara Region, 29 were from the Mediterranean Region, 24 were from the Central Anatolian Region, 16 were from the Southeastern Anatolian Region, 14 were from the Black Sea Region, 13 were from the Aegean Region, and 11 were from the Eastern Anatolian Region.

The data-collection instrument used in this study was developed based on earlier studies on the subject, particularly those conducted by Fritz, Karmazin, Barbuto, and Burrow (2003); Boz and Verma (2001); Culp (1997); Kwarteng, Smith, and Miller (1988); and K. L. Smith and Bigler (1985). It consisted of two major sections. The first section sought information about the factors influencing respondents' decisions to provide their voluntary services, their perceptions of the outcomes of any orientation programs in which they had participated, and the types of recognition they desired. The responses of these subjects were given using a 5-point, Likert-type scale, in which 1 = *strongly disagree*, 2 = *disagree*, 3 = *neutral*, 4 = *agree*, and 5 = *strongly agree*. The second section of the survey elicited information about the demographic characteristics of the respondents and included continuous and categorical data. A panel of experts consisting of one professor and three assistant professors from Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University, Turkey, and three adult volunteers working for the TOG, established the validity of the instrument. The panel of experts initially focused on the issue of concept representation by the instrument and also checked the level of instrument completeness. If there was a lack of consensus among the members of the panel about an item, it was modified or deleted from the questionnaire. Reliability was also assessed for the Likert-type items of the instrument. The Cronbach's alpha internal-consistency coefficients were calculated as 0.87 for motivational factors, 0.91 for the outcomes of an orientation/training program, and 0.89 for the types of recognition desired by volunteers.

SPSS version 11.5 (SPSS Inc., 2002) was used for data analyses. Descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were used to accomplish the first and second objectives. The principal component analysis method for extraction and the varimax with Kaiser normalization method for rotation was used to accomplish the third objective of the study.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The first objective of the study was to demographically describe the community volunteers based on the following characteristics: age, gender, college major, geographic region of residency, marital status, monthly expenditure, father's occupation, mother's occupation, parents' place of residence, and parents' monthly income. The results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Community Volunteers

<i>Demographic Characteristics</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Demographic Characteristics</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>%</i>
Age			Father's occupation		
17 to 20	63	36.1	Retired	66	37.7
21 to 23	91	52.1	Own business	32	18.3
24 to 25	21	11.8	Worker	15	8.6
Gender			Farmer	12	6.9
Male	110	62.9	Private company employee	12	6.9
Female	65	37.1	State sector employee	12	6.3
Major			Teacher	10	5.7
Engineering	59	33.7	Deceased	5	2.9
Economics	56	32.0	Other	11	6.7
Business	42	24.0	Mother's occupation		
Public finance	14	8.0	Homemaker	137	78.3
Physical training	4	2.3	Retired	22	12.6
Region			Worker	5	2.9
Marmara	68	38.9	Teacher	5	2.9
Mediterranean	29	16.6	Hairdresser	2	1.1
Central Anatolia	24	13.7	Textile designer	2	1.1
Southeastern Anatolia	16	9.1	Other	2	1.1
Black Sea Region	14	8.0	Parents' place of residence		
Aegean Region	13	7.4	Metropolitan area	77	44.0
Eastern Anatolia	11	6.3	City	35	20.0
Marital status			County	42	24.0
Single	167	95.4	Small town	5	2.9
Married	8	4.6	Village	16	9.1
Monthly expenditures ^a			Parents' family income		
50 million or less	7	4.0	500 million or less	24	13.7
51-100 million	19	10.9	501-750 million	40	22.9
101-200 million	34	19.4	751 million-1 billion	37	21.1
201-250 million	36	20.6	1.1-1.5 billion	32	18.3
251-300 million	24	13.7	1.6-2.0 billion	21	12.0
301-350 million	10	5.7	More than 2 billion	21	12.0
More than 350 million	45	25.7			

a. On April 14, 2003, \$1 (US dollar) was worth 1,346,000 Turkish liras.

More than half of the respondents were aged 21 to 23 years, and the mean age was calculated as 21.41 years. In total, 69% of the respondents were males and 37% were females. Of these, 34% were engineering majors, including agriculture and forestry engineering, followed by economics, business, public finance, and physical training majors. In total, 39% of the respondents came from the Marmara Region, and only 6% were from Eastern Anatolia Region. The majority (95%) of respondents were single. A large range of monthly expenditure was reported, from less than 50 million Turkish liras (US\$37.15) to more than 350 million Turkish liras (US\$260.03), with the

Table 2. Factors Motivating Community Volunteers

Order	Factor	M	SD	Category
1	I feel happy as I make others happy	4.37	0.81	A
2	I want to help people	4.33	0.89	A
3	I feel that I am increasing my self-confidence	4.02	1.01	A
4	I think volunteering is a humanity issue	4.02	1.06	A
5	I feel needed	3.95	0.96	A
6	I feel more successful as I help people	3.95	1.02	A
7	I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself	3.94	1.03	A
8	I want to share my knowledge and skills with other volunteers	3.80	1.03	A
9	I want to improve my social relationships	3.73	1.11	A
10	I want to work and be together with adult professionals	3.66	1.11	A
11	I can receive information about the innovations in society	3.56	1.15	A
12	I want to work with people who have different personalities	3.52	1.16	A
13	Volunteering may help me with my career in the future	3.51	1.18	A
14	I think that volunteerism is a moral issue	3.45	1.23	N
15	Doing volunteer work enables me to show my leadership	3.40	1.25	N
16	I feel others know and respect me	3.30	1.29	N
17	I volunteer because people I like recommended it.	3.24	1.22	N
18	Our traditions suggest that I must do volunteer work for others	3.14	1.23	N
19	I want to make new friends	3.14	1.13	N
20	I can learn how to spend my leisure time more effectively	3.11	1.41	N
21	Volunteering may lead to employment in the future	2.96	1.31	N
22	I want to meet new people	2.94	1.24	N
23	I think volunteerism is a religious duty	2.86	1.38	N
24	I volunteer because my family values volunteerism	2.86	1.27	N
25	I volunteer because I have extra time	2.84	1.30	N
26	I volunteer because people I am close to value volunteerism	2.64	1.23	N

Note: A = agree; N = neutral.

median falling in the 201 to 250 million Turkish liras (US\$149.33-\$185.73) category. A large variety of occupations were reported for the respondents' fathers and mothers, with retired fathers comprising the largest (38%)

occupational group and the majority of mothers (78%) being homemakers. In total, 44% of the parents lived in metropolitan areas, and only 9% lived in villages. The parents' monthly family income varied from less than 500 million Turkish liras (US\$371.47) to more than 2 billion Turkish liras (US\$1,485.88), with a median income of between 751 million and 1 billion Turkish liras (US\$557.95-742.94; see Table 1).

Part A of Objective 2 was to describe community volunteers based on their perception of the influence of initial motivators, orientation, and recognition factors on their decision to provide voluntary services for the TOG. To interpret the mean values of the level of agreement for each item, an interpretative scale was developed as follows: 1.00 to 1.49 = *strongly disagree* (SD), 1.50 to 2.49 = *disagree* (D), 2.50 to 3.49 = *neutral* (N), 3.50 to 4.49 = *agree* (A), and 4.50 to 5.00 = *strongly agree* (SA). Based on this scale, 50% (13) of the items fell into the A category and the remaining 50% fell into the N category. There were no items in the SA, D, and SD categories. The three items with the highest means were "I feel happy when I make others happy" (mean = 4.37), "I want to help people" (mean = 4.33), and "I feel that I am increasing my self confidence" (mean = 4.02). The three items with the lowest means were "I volunteer because my family values volunteerism" (mean = 2.86), "I volunteer because I have extra time" (mean = 2.84), and "I volunteer because people I am close to value volunteerism" (mean = 2.64; see Table 2).

Part B of Objective 2 was to determine the outcomes of attending an orientation program before initiating volunteer work with the TOG. An orientation program was aimed to give basic information about volunteering, to teach the mission and philosophy of the organization, and to give instructions about the duties and responsibilities of volunteers taking part in different projects (TOG, 2004). The respondents indicated that, although participating in an orientation program was useful, it was not mandatory to become a member of the volunteer organization.

However, starting in 2004, the organization has developed a five-stage orientation program to recruit and utilize volunteers. The first stage involves a meeting with the newly recruited volunteers, in which the vision, mission, purpose, and objectives of the organization are explained. Those who attend this meeting receive the "yellow key" of the organization, which indicates interest in volunteering. The second, third, and fourth stages of the orientation program are carried out by the Training Department of the TOG. Basic volunteering issues, thoughts about volunteering, and the history of civil community organizations are explained in the second stage, and a "blue key" representing endless volunteer service and productivity is given at the end of this stage. The third stage of the orientation program includes technical instructions on community projects preparation, administration, and implementation. Those who pass this stage receive a "red key," which represents continuously increasing productivity. In the fourth stage, teamwork is emphasized, and a "green key" representing trust is given to attendees. No training is provided during the last stage of the orientation program;

Table 3. Outcomes of an Orientation Program

Order	Factor	M	SD	Category
1	I learned my duties and responsibilities	4.18	0.91	A
2	It helped me to understand the basic philosophy and principles of volunteerism	4.17	0.90	A
3	I learned how to utilize different people	4.00	1.04	A
4	It helped me to know other people in the organization	3.96	0.84	A
5	It helped me to understand people and their needs	3.96	1.07	A
6	I learned how to plan and implement activities	3.93	0.95	A
7	It helped me to organize a meeting	3.86	1.09	A

Note: A = agree.

Table 4. Recognition Methods Desired by Volunteers

Order	Factor	M	SD	Category
1	Recognition is not important; the important thing is to help people in need.	4.59	0.89	SA
2	Visits from the people I helped	2.80	1.35	N
3	Phone calls from the people I helped	2.67	1.39	N
4	Visits from the other members of the volunteer organization	2.59	1.39	N
5	Letters from the people I helped	2.54	1.38	N
6	Announcement by the volunteer organization	1.58	0.89	D

Note: SA = strongly agree; N = neutral; D = disagree.

rather, once the members have actively taken part in sustainable projects in different provinces and have continued their volunteer service for least 2 years, they earn the “white key” of the TOG, which represents stability, productivity, and purity (TOG, 2006).

Because the data for this study were collected before the five-stage orientation program had been initiated, the respondents were not questioned about the details of this program. They were instead asked whether they had taken part in an orientation program before becoming a volunteer and, if so, to indicate the extent to which they agreed that any volunteer orientation program in which they had participated had accomplished its purpose and/or resulted in benefits. The results showed that only 34% (60) of the respondents had taken part in an orientation program.

The demographic characteristics of the respondents who took part in an orientation program showed no significant differences from those of the whole sample. To make comparisons between oriented and unoriented groups, an independent sample *t* test for continuous variables and a chi-square test for independence for categorical variables were conducted. The results showed that the average age of the oriented group was 21.15 years and that of the unoriented group was 21.54 years ($t = 1.28, p = .201$). Male participants comprised 70% of the oriented group and 65% of the unoriented

Table 5. Rotated Component Matrix for Motivational Factors

<i>Motivational Factors</i>	<i>Components Extracted</i>		
	1	2	3
<i>Altruistic reasons</i>			
5. I feel needed	.811		
2. I want to help people	.810		
7. I am concerned about those less fortunate than myself	.784		
18. Our traditions suggest that I must do volunteer work for others	.760		
23. I think volunteerism is a religious duty	.743		
24. I volunteer because my family values volunteerism	.722		
14. I think that volunteerism is a moral issue	.694		
4. I think volunteering is a humanity issue	.666		
1. I feel happy as I make others happy	.581		
26. I volunteer because people I am close to value volunteerism	.548		
<i>Affiliative reasons</i>			
19. I want to make new friends		.775	
9. I want to improve my social relationships		.716	
8. I want to share my knowledge and skills with other volunteers		.658	
22. I want to meet new people		.644	
12. I want to work with people who have different personalities		.641	
15. Doing volunteer work enables me to show my leadership		.627	
10. I want to work and be together with adult professionals		.594	
<i>Personal improvement</i>			
6. I feel more successful as I help people			.684
16. I feel others know and respect me			.611
11. I can receive information about the innovations in society			.608
20. I can learn how to spend my leisure time more effectively			.561
3. I feel that I am increasing my self-confidence			.522
13. Volunteering may help me with my career in the future			.468
21. Volunteering may lead to employment in the future			.462

Note: Extraction method: principal component analysis. Rotation method: varimax with Kaiser normalization. Rotation converged in six iterations.

group, $\chi^2(1, n = 175)$, 0.52, $p = .32$. The other chi-square test results for the demographic characteristics were as follows: for college major, $\chi^2(4, n = 175)$, 5.33, $p = .22$; for region, $\chi^2(6, n = 175)$, 0.6.80, $p = .14$; for marital status, $\chi^2(1, n = 175)$, 0.16, $p = .34$; for monthly expenditure, $\chi^2(6, n = 175)$, 5.76, $p = .21$; for parents' place of residence, $\chi^2(4, n = 175)$, 1.76, $p = .78$; and for parents'

family income, χ^2 (5, $n = 175$), 10.67, $p = .58$. As there were zero observations in some cells, chi-square tests were invalid for the variables father's occupation and mother's occupation. No comparisons for these two variables were made.

Participants' responses regarding orientation program outcomes are presented in Table 3. All of the volunteers agreed with the selected outcomes of the orientation program in which they took part. The greatest benefits offered by orientation programs were teaching participants about their duties and responsibilities within the organization (mean = 4.18), helping members to understand the basic philosophy and principles of volunteering (mean = 4.17), and teaching participants how to work with different people (mean = 4.00); the least valuable outcome was helping to organize meetings (mean = 3.86; see Table 3).

Part C of Objective 2 was to determine what type of recognition that the respondents desired for their volunteer activity. For this purpose, the respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed that various methods should be used to recognize volunteers. The results are presented in Table 4. In terms of the interpretive scale, one item fell within the SA category, four items fell within the N category, and one item fell within the D category. The item with which respondents most strongly agreed was, "Recognition is not important, the important thing is to help people in need" (mean = 4.59), whereas the item with which respondents disagreed was, "Announcement by the volunteer organization" (mean = 1.58; see Table 4).

The third objective of the study was to determine whether any underlying factors could be identified from the motivators that influenced respondents to participate in the TOG. The motivator section of the measuring instrument in this study consisted of 26 items, and the scale was analyzed using the factor analysis procedure. The item "I volunteer because people I like recommended it" had high loadings in the first and second components. The item "I volunteer because I have extra time" had high loadings in the second and third components. These items were thus removed from the scale, and the rotated component matrix for the remaining 24 items was calculated. Table 5 shows that three components were extracted from the 24 item motivators: (a) altruistic reasons, explaining 28.94% of the total variance; (b) affiliative reasons, explaining 16.76% of the variance; and (c) personal improvement reasons, explaining 14.36% of the variance. Together, these three components explained 60.06% of the variance (see Table 5).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study suggested the following profile of the average community volunteer in Turkey: 22 years old, male college student pursuing a career in engineering, economics, or business; living in the Marmara, Mediterranean, or Central Anatolia Region; single; spending 201 to 250

million Turkish liras per month; the child of a retired man or a businessman and a housewife; parents living in a metropolitan area and earning a monthly income of 751 million to 1 billion Turkish liras.

The respondents in this study agreed with 13 of the 26 motivational factors, and remained neutral for the remaining 13 items. The most important motivational factor was "I feel happy when I make others happy," whereas the least important motivational factor was, "I volunteer because people to whom I am close value volunteerism." The respondents agreed with all of the outcomes of the orientation program. Recognition was not considered as an important issue. Respondents strongly agreed that the important motivator was not recognition but "to help people." They also did not want their activities to be announced by the organization.

Altruistic reasons had the highest influence in persuading the members of Turkey's TOG to donate their voluntary service. This was followed by affiliative reasons and personal improvement reasons, respectively. Compared with the earlier studies of Hiller (1983), Henderson (1981), Rouse and Clawson (1992), and Culp (1997), the current study found that altruistic reasons had a greater influence on Turkey's community volunteers. This motive ranked second in Henderson's study, and was hardly mentioned in the other studies. However, the affiliation motive, which was the second component in the current study, had the highest influence in both the Hiller and the Rouse and Clawson study, and had the second highest influence in the Culp study. The personal improvement or achievement motive, which was the third component in the current study, had the greatest influence in the Rouse and Clawson study and was the third most important motive in the Hiller and the Culp studies.

Although the findings regarding altruism in the current study showed differences compared with earlier studies conducted in the United States, they were similar to those of the Sherer (2004) study in Israel. In both studies, altruistic reasons were the most important factors in initiating voluntary work for an organization. This discrepancy might be because of economic and cultural differences between Western and Eastern societies. In terms of economics, as the welfare level in a society goes up, individuals who are less fortunate might decrease in number, and volunteers might contribute their services for affiliation and achievement reasons instead of altruism. This could be the situation with the volunteers in the United States. As the welfare levels in Turkey and Israel are lower than those in the United States, the dependence of individuals on each other might be greater.

Although Turkish society has been making a transition from East to West since the foundation of modern Turkey in 1923, it still carries the influences of Eastern societies, where altruism might have a higher value to an individual when providing voluntary services for others. One of the main factors motivating individuals to perform volunteer services for altruistic reasons could be related to Islamic culture, which influences the way of thinking and the lifestyles of many people in Turkey. Although the Civil Code and all

other laws and regulations were adopted from Europe and Turkey is a secular state, religion still has deep influences on human relationships and the lifestyles of Turkish people.

According to the Islamic religion, no self-sacrifice will remain without reward after death; thus, volunteer service is strongly encouraged among Muslims. Because the religion has begun to lose its influence due to materialism, positivism, and individualism, levels of unity and support in Islamic societies have gradually decreased (Sadikoglu, 2006). However, the findings of the current study show that altruistic reasons, which can be related to religion, still have the largest motivational influence on unity and assistance among individuals.

The findings of this study verify that to increase the numbers of volunteers in different organizations, the altruism aspect of volunteering should be emphasized when recruiting volunteers in Turkey. The missions, philosophies, and principles of volunteer organizations should be taught through different orientation and training programs. Although community volunteers are not concerned with monetary recognition, they should be made to feel needed and a part of the volunteer organization. As Henderson (1980) pointed out, volunteering is a humanistic activity. Volunteers should, therefore, be treated as individual human beings with dignity and worth. They should be encouraged to support different volunteer programs.

Because this was a case study and the target population included volunteers aged 17 to 25 years who were members of Turkey's TOG, the findings can only be generalized to this population. The findings imply that the members of this organization are motivated by altruism, affiliation, and personal achievement reasons (in descending order). However, a nationwide survey of the members of other volunteer organizations, including adult volunteers, will be needed for this theory to be further developed.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Toward an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67*, 422-436.
- Alderfer, C. (1972). *Existence, relatedness, and growth*. New York: Free Press.
- Ayyildiz, T. (1975). *Socioeconomic structure of Buyukdere village* (University Publication No. 378, Faculty of Agriculture Publication No. 182, Research Series No. 113). Erzurum, Turkey: Ataturk University Press.
- Boz, I. (2005, August 30-September 3). *Opportunities and obstacles of volunteer participation in Turkey's Agricultural Extension System*. Paper presented at the 17th European Seminar on Extension Education, Izmir, Turkey.
- Boz, I., & Verma, S. (2001, April 4-7). *Factors influencing adult volunteer 4-H leadership in Louisiana*. Paper presented at the 17th Annual Conference of Association for International Agricultural and Extension Education, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1991). A functional analysis of altruism and prosocial behavior: The case of volunteerism. In M. Clark (Ed.), *Prosocial behavior* (pp.119-148). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (1999). The motivations to volunteer: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8*(5), 156-159.

- Clary, E. G., & Snyder, M. (2002). Community involvement: Opportunities and challenges in socializing adults to participate in society. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*(3), 581-591.
- Clary, E. G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R. D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A. A., Haugen, J., et al. (1998). Understanding and assessing motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(6), 1516-1530.
- Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics). New York: John Wiley.
- Culp, K., III. (1997). Motivating and retaining adult volunteer 4-H leaders. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 38*(2), 1-7.
- Fisher, C. J., & Cole, K. M. (1993). *Leadership and management of volunteer programs: A guide for volunteer administrators*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Florida Cooperative Extension Service (FCES). (2001). *Florida 4-H program handbook*. Gainesville: University of Florida.
- Fritz, S., Karmazin, D., Barbuto, J., Jr., & Burrow, S. (2003). Urban and rural 4-H adult volunteer leaders' preferred forms of recognition and motivation. *Journal of Extension, 42*(3). Retrieved July 3, 2004, from <http://www.joe.org/>
- Henderson, K. A. (1980, September). Programming volunteerism for happier volunteers. *Journal of Parks and Recreation, 15*(9), 61-64.
- Henderson, K. A. (1981). Motivating the adult 4-H volunteer. *Journal of Extension, 19*, 9-27.
- Herzberg, F. (1968, January-February). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 53-63.
- Hiller, J. H. (1983). *4-H Volunteer leader motivation/recognition study*. Pullman: Washington State University Cooperative Extension Service.
- Huit, W. (2001). Motivation to learn: An overview. *Educational Psychology Interactive*. Valdosta, GA: Valdosta State University. Retrieved October 2, 2005, from <http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/motivation/motivate.html>
- Katz, D. (1960). The functional approach to the study of attitudes. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 24*, 163-204.
- Kleinginna, P., Jr., & Kleinginna, A. (1981). A categorized list of motivation definitions, with suggestions for a consensual definition. *Motivation and Emotion, 5*, 263-291.
- Kwarteng, J. A., Smith, K. L., & Miller, L. E. (1988). Ohio 4-H agents' and volunteer leaders' perception of volunteer leadership development program. *Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 29*(2), 55-62.
- Lawless, D. J. (1972). *Effective management: Social psychological approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lussier, R. N. (1999). *Human relations in organizations: Applications and skill building* (4th ed.). Boston: Irwin McGraw Hill.
- Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper.
- McClelland, D. C. (1992). Motivational configurations. In C. P. Smith (Ed.), *Motivation and personality: Handbook of thematic content analysis* (pp. 87-99). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Okun, M. A., Barr, A., & Herzog, A. R. (1998). Motivation to volunteer by older adults: A test of competing measurement models. *Psychology and Aging, 13*, 608-621.
- Ozkaya, T., Karaturhan, B., & Boyaci, M. (2003). *Participatory rural development approach: Menemen project application* (Ege University Agricultural Research and Application Center, Publication No. 239). Ankara, Turkey: Burcu Ofset.
- Rouse, S. B. & Clawson, B. (1992). Motives and incentives of older volunteers. *Journal of Extension, 30*(3). Retrieved December 17, 2003, from <http://www.joe.org/>
- Sadikoglu, N. (2006). TGTV'den Fatih Universitesi'nde girisimcilik kongresine katilim (TGTV's participation in entrepreneurship congress held at Fatih University). Turkiye Gonullu Tesekkuller Vakfi (IGTV)—Turkey's Foundation for Volunteer Organizations (TFVO). Retrieved May 20, 2006, from <http://www.tgtv.org/Haberler.asp>
- Schram, V. R. (1985). Motivating volunteers to participate. In L. F. Moore (Ed.), *Motivating volunteers: How the rewards of unpaid work can meet people's needs* (pp. 13-29). Vancouver, Canada: Vancouver Volunteer Centre.

- Sherer, M. (2004). National service in Israel: Motivations, volunteer characteristics, and level of content. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 33(1), 94-108.
- Skinner, B. F. (1971). *Beyond freedom and dignity*. New York: Knopf.
- Smith, C. P., Atkinson, J. W., McClelland, D. C., & Veroff, J. (1992). *Motivation and personality: Handbook of thematic content analysis*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, D. H. (1981). Altruism, volunteers and volunteerism. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 10, 21-36.
- Smith, D. H. (1994). Determinants of voluntary association participation and volunteering: A literature review. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 23(3), 243-263.
- Smith, K. L., & Bigler, N. M. (1985). Keeping 4-H volunteer leaders: Why some stay and some don't. *Journal of Extension*, 23(2). Retrieved September 10, 2005, from <http://www.joe.org/>
- Smith, M., Bruner, J., & White, R. (1956). *Opinions and personality*. New York: John Wiley.
- SPSS Inc. (2002). *SPSS—Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 11.5*. Chicago: Author.
- TOG (Toplum Gonulluleri). (2004). *Community volunteers*. Retrieved September 11, 2004, from the Community Volunteers Foundation Web site: <http://www.tog.org.tr/communityvolunteers.pdf>
- TOG (Toplum Gonulluleri). (2006). *Community volunteers*. Retrieved May 3, 2006, from <http://www.tog.org.tr/communityvolunteers.pdf>
- Veroff, J. (1992). Power motivation. In C. P. Smith (Ed.), *Motivating and personality: Handbook of thematic content analysis* (pp. 278-286). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley.

Ismet Boz is an associate professor in the Department of Agricultural Economics at Kahramanmaraş Sutcu Imam University (KSU) Turkey. He received his doctorate degree from Louisiana State University School of Vocational Education in May 2000. His concentration area was adult extension and international education. His main duties at KSU include teaching agricultural extension classes and conducting research on various subjects relating to agricultural and rural communities.

Serap Palaz is an associate professor in the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences at Balıkesir University in Turkey. She received her doctorate degree from De Montfort University in England in 1999. Her teaching and research priorities are social policy, management of human resources, and gender segregation in different organizations.